

# **Finding of No Significant Impact:**



# Table of Contents

<b>1. Finding of No Significant Impact .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Proposed Pile Burn In Gypsum Wash .....	1
1.2. Context: .....	1
1.3. Intensity: .....	1
1.4. Signed: .....	2



# **Chapter 1. Finding of No Significant Impact**



## 1.1. Proposed Pile Burn In Gypsum Wash

DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2010-0034

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2010-0034 dated [Date of EA]. After consideration of the environmental effects as described in the EA, and incorporated herein, I have determined that the proposed action identified in the EA will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required to be prepared.

I have determined the proposed action is in conformance with the approved Las Vegas Resource Management Plan, and is consistent with applicable plans and policies of county, state, tribal and Federal agencies. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

## 1.2. Context:

The lands for the proposed pile burn are managed by the Bureau of Land Management and private land holders. The federal land is managed to maintain or improve the condition of vegetation to a desired plant community or to a potential natural community. Permissions from the private landholder have been attained so that the project area can be managed in alignment with federal management objective and directions.

## 1.3. Intensity:

### 1. *Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.*

The EA has considered both the beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action. There would be substantial benefits to native plant life in the wash resulting from the reduced threat of wildfire in their vicinity. The action would also be beneficial to the re-establishment of native vegetation in the project area. This action may result in tamarisk re-establishing in the area however post burn monitoring can determine future treatments to prevent this.

### 2. *The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.*

Outside of the burning operation no impacts to public health and safety will result from this project. During the firing operation smoke will impact visibility on the road, warning signs will be posted to alert the public of the impact.

### 3. *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*

Gypsum Wash is in the Rainbow Gardens ACEC and partially on private land owned by Pabco Building Supplies LLC. This project will not impact any unique characteristics of either the ACEC or the private land.

### 4. *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be controversial.*

There will be no lasting effects on the human environment.

5. *The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*

No unique and unknown risks are present to the human environment. Little uncertainty exists as the project is limited to the wash.

6. *The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.*

The proposed action is being completed within existing authorities, policies and regulations and does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects.

7. *Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.*

No significant cumulative impacts were identified in the EA.

8. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.*

No adverse effects to NRHP eligible sites or structures, or to any scientific, cultural or historical resources, are expected to result from the proposed action.

9. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the ESA of 1973.*

No adverse affects to endangered or threatened species or habitat will result from this project.

10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.*

Prescribed burning is a federal maintenance activity which does not violate any Federal, State, or local law. Burns area conduced in accordance with approved burn plans and comply with requirements for environmental protection.

## 1.4. Signed:

Kevin Oliver		[Date]
AFM Fire (Fire Management Officer)		